

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the abstract and claims 1 and 8-10 have been amended. Claims 1-10 are pending and under consideration.

On pages 2-3, in item 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 8-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner cited "and by connecting with edges the element nodes and the attribute nodes of the possessed attributes thereof" found, for example, at lines 26-29 of claim 1.

As clearly described in the specification, the element nodes that appear in the above-quoted text from the description of the second network display are the same network nodes that are recited as part of the first network display. For example, claim 1 recites displaying a first network by "arranging and displaying ... the element information as element nodes" (claim 1, lines 9-11). Then, a second network is displayed by "converting possessed attributes of the element nodes in the first network in a display of attribute nodes for arrangement" (claim 1, lines 13-14). To complete the transition from the first to the second network display, claim 1, for example, recites "connecting with edges the element nodes and the attribute nodes of the possessed attributes thereof" at lines 14-15. The above-quoted language taken from claim 1 is shown in the embodiment of Figure 1, where the first network display process unit 32 and the second network display process unit 34 output to the display 24 (page 14, line 27 to page 15, line 4 and page 15, lines 14-23).

For the above reasons, it is submitted that claims 1 and 8-10 recite what "the element nodes" means and how the element nodes are transferred from the first network display to the second network display. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph is respectfully requested.

On page 3, in item 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 2-7 as being dependent on rejected base claims. As discussed above, claim 1 meets the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Therefore, withdrawal of the objections to claims 2-7 is respectfully requested.

On page 2, in item 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner noted that the Abstract was too long. The abstract is herein amended to comply with the requirements. Acceptance of the amended abstract is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10/20/06

By: Richard A. Gollhofer
Richard A. Gollhofer
Registration No. 31,109

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501